

Miami Dade County

Stephen P. Clark Government Center
111 N.W. 1st Street
Miami, Fl. 33128



OFFICE OF THE COMMISSION AUDITOR
Legislative Division

Tuesday, October 12, 2004
2:00 pm
Commission Chambers

Board of County Commissioners

Public Safety Committee

LEGISLATIVE ANALYSIS AND ECONOMIC IMPACT STATEMENT

RESOLUTION DIRECTING THE MANAGER TO CREATE AND IMPLEMENT A PROACTIVE EDUCATION AND ENFORCEMENT CAMPAIGN TO PREVENT THE THEFT OF SHOPPING CARTS; AND DIRECTING THE MANAGER TO ENFORCE COUNTY CODE SECTIONS 8A-76 AND 8A-76.1 REQUIRING BUSINESS ESTABLISHMENTS TO POST SIGNS WARNING SHOPPERS ABOUT THE ILLEGALITY OF REMOVING SHOPPING CARTS FROM PLACES OF BUSINESS

Commissioner Javier D. Souto

I. SUMMARY

This proposed ordinance would direct the County Manager to implement a proactive education and enforcement campaign to prevent the ongoing theft of shopping carts. In addition, the proposed ordinance would direct the County Manager to enforce Sec. 8A-76 and 8A-76.1 relating to required signage to reduce the theft and removal of shopping carts from business premises. Copies of Sec. 8A-76 and Sec. 8A-76.1 are appended as Attachment #1.

II. PRESENT SITUATION

Sec. 8A-76(a) provided for businesses to put a warning notice in English and Spanish on all shopping carts unless the firm meets certain requirements and obtains an exemption from the Director of Consumer Services Department (CSD).

- Sec. 8A-76, which was established by Ordinance 96-3, included a sunset provision that may have repealed this section in January 2001. Extension beyond the sunset date is unclear; see Section V of this analysis for additional information on the sunset provision.

Sec. 8A-76.1 (which was separately enacted in Ordinance 97-213 and did not include a sunset provision) provides for:

- (1) A "*shopping cart identification sign*" with the name, address and phone number of the retail establishment and civil penalties for failure to comply;
- (2) Delegation of enforcement authority and responsibility to the Department Solid Waste Management;
- (3) Designation of all "*employees and officers of Miami-Dade County*" as agents of the County and directs that "*any identifiable shopping carts found on public property during the course of their official duties shall be reported to the Department of Solid Waste Management....[that] shall collect the shopping carts and place them in storage.*"
- (4) Notice to shopping cart owners, retrieval responsibility, penalties and fees.

III. POLICY CHANGE AND IMPLICATION

Aggressive enforcement may improve the appearance of our communities and would support the efforts of the Community Image Advisory Board.

PSC ITEM 3(D)
October 12, 2004

Cost to Businesses

The remedies required for a business to maintain an exemption from this Code may be cost prohibitive for said establishment.

The provisions of Sec. 8A-76, state that the Director of the Consumer Services Department may grant an exemption to the requirement of this section if an establishment:

- (1) Constructs barriers to prevent the removal of shopping carts; or
- (2) Attaches alarm mechanisms to shopping carts to prevent their removal; or
- (3) Implements a policy of not allowing the customer to exit the store with shopping carts, provides an employee to carry or wheel the customer's merchandise to the customers' vehicle, and agrees to implement a program to collect their own carts that are illegally removed.

These provisions may require an undue financial burden on businesses wishing to locate in Miami-Dade County and/or current businesses operating in the County.

Further, many establishments that utilize shopping carts share property (i.e. strip malls) with other business who may not desire remedies such as barriers surrounding said properties.

Will these adjacent properties also be required to bare some portion of the costs associated with these upgrades?

Some of these businesses may contest that any changes to the ingress or egress of these properties could have a negative effect on their businesses.

IV. ECONOMIC IMPACT

Aggressive enforcement may increase costs for the Department of Solid Waste Management.

There may be further costs associated with the requirements of the Solid Waste Departments' increased responsibility to notify the business owners of any infractions under this section.

V. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS

Ordinance 96-3, which created Sec. 8A-76 of the Code, included a 5-year sunset provision in Sec. 8A-76(e) to automatically repeal the ordinance on January 19, 2001, 5 years from its effective date. (Note: Subsection 8A-76.1 was separately enacted in Ordinance 97-213 and did not include a sunset provision.)

PSC ITEM 3(D)
October 12, 2004

- It is unclear whether Ordinance 96-3 was ever accepted by the BCC for extension beyond its sunset date.
 - A “Sunset Review of County Ordinances for 2000” for Consumer Services Department was accepted by the BCC on July 25, 2000, but the item stated it was only a review of ordinances in effect prior to January 1, 1995, which was prior to the enactment of Ordinance 96-3.
 - A “Sunset Review of Ordinances 2001” for the Department Solid Waste Management was accepted by the BCC on April 24, 2001, but this was more than three (3) months after the scheduled sunset of Ordinance 96-3.
 - Review of legislative items available through multiple online searches of the County’s Internet and Intranet websites did not resolve the question of whether or not Ordinance 96-3 sunset in January 2001.

Possible Problems

1. The County may encounter problems enforcing the penalties listed under this new section as it relates to shopping carts left on private property by a person who does not own, or live at said property.
2. Several communities, such areas of Miami Beach, may have a large number of residents who do not own automobiles due to a lack of need or age. These residents, however, may live adjacent to shopping centers and may utilize these carts to transport groceries from the store to their homes with the intent of returning that cart.

LEGISLATIVE ANALYSIS AND ECONOMIC IMPACT STATEMENT

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING EXECUTION OF A LEASE AGREEMENT AT THE 12000 S.W. 49 STREET, MIAMI, WITH RAUL DOMINGUEZ, FOR PREMISES UTILIZED BY THE MIAMI-DADE POLICE DEPARTMENT FOR ITS MOUNTED PATROL UNIT; AND AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY MANAGER TO EXERCISE ANY AND ALL OTHER RIGHTS CONFERRED THEREIN

General Services Administration Department

I. SUMMARY

This is a proposal to execute a 5-year lease for facilities for use by the Miami-Dade Police Department Mounted Patrol Unit at 12000 SW 49 St. at a first year cost of \$72,176.80 (includes: \$66,219.96 annual rent, \$5,297.54 lease management, & \$660 phone service.) Facilities include 8 horse stables, office space, restroom, shower, washer & dryer area, parking and use of adjacent paddock for equine activities.

II. PRESENT SITUATION

The Mounted Patrol Unit is presently at Paradise Farm of Miami, Inc., 12265 SW 56 St and could exercise the third & final one-year option to renew at a cost of \$66,219.96 under the terms of the lease approved in 2001 (R-1015-01).

III. POLICY CHANGE AND IMPLICATION

The terms of the existing contract and proposed new contract provide similar terms: stabling/care/feeding of horses, utilities, administrative space, and ability to expand for up to 6 more horses.

IV. ECONOMIC IMPACT

\$72,176.80 (MDPD-first year & +2% each subsequent year). [The previous contract provided for 3% increase each year.]

V. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS

Wording describing lease conditions, availability of administrative space, and other terms are virtually identical in the County Manager's memoranda recommending this Item and the one that recommended the 2001 agenda item. Notable exceptions are: (1) the memorandum in 2001 praised that facility's suitability for "renovations to the space as required, and occupy office space at the site;" (2) the memorandum recommending this Item notes availability of adjacent paddock space and the 1% lower annual cost increase that is incorporated in the proposed contract.

LEGISLATIVE ANALYSIS AND ECONOMIC IMPACT STATEMENT

ORDINANCE AMENDING SECTIONS 2-98.4 THROUGH 2-98.11 OF THE CODE OF MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA CONCERNING NUISANCE ABATEMENT; REVISING PURPOSE, DEFINITIONS, OPERATING PROCEDURES, THE PUBLIC NUISANCE ABATEMENT BOARD, HEARING PROCESS AND FEES AND COSTS; PROVIDING SEVERABILITY, INCLUSION IN THE CODE, AND AN EFFECTIVE DATE

Miami-Dade Police Department

SUMMARY

This proposed ordinance would amend Chapter 2 of the Code to:

- Increases authorities and broadens the range of included offenses under the Nuisance Abatement Ordinance (NAO) and of the Nuisance Abatement Board (NAB), including authority for the NAB to impose fines and issue subpoenas;
- Expands the NAB membership from 9 members to 13 members (one per commission district);
- Liberalizes NAB membership to permit non-residents of Miami-Dade County; and
- Expand NAO coverage to municipalities with which interlocal agreements have been executed.
- Authorizes retroactive application of the changes to the original date of adoption of the ordinance, or the dates of amendments to Florida Statutes, 893.138 that authorize the changes.

The Public Safety Committee (PSC) on July 20, 2004 expressed concern about clarifying each municipality's option to execute an interlocal agreement for Miami-Dade Police Department (MDPD) assistance with nuisance properties within the municipality, regardless of whether or not they contract for MDPD police services. The text of the proposed item does not appear to address the PSC's concerns even though the County Manager's memorandum recommending the item indicates it was addressed.

PRESENT SITUATION

After a premise is considered a public nuisance, the NAB can order the property owner to pay costs, but the NAB cannot impose fines.

NAB membership is now defined as 9 members

POLICY CHANGE AND IMPLICATION

To activities that can trigger a premise being determined to be a public nuisance:

- Adds "*possession*" of controlled substances, illegal "*possession*" of alcoholic beverages, and "*other criminal activity as defined in federal laws and/or Florida Statutes, or violations of the Code of Miami-Dade County;*"

PSC ITEM 4(E)
October 12, 2004

- Reduces to one (1), the number of incidents of use *“by a youth and criminal street gang for the purpose of conducting a pattern of your and criminal street gang activity”* [previously required more than two (2) such uses];
- With premise use on more than two (2) occasions within 12 months:
 - Adds *“Manufacture, cultivation, or possession”* of controlled substances *“including, but not limited to substances and pharmaceuticals...any substance sold in lieu of a controlled substance...or any imitation controlled substance”*
 - Clarifies prostitution includes *“any violation of Florida Statutes Chapter 796, as it may be renumbered or amended from time to time,”*
 - Adds illegal *“possession”* of *“containers, or open containers”* of alcoholic beverages;
 - Adds *“as site of...dealing in stone property:”*
 - Adds *“as site of juveniles in violation the Miami-Dade County Juvenile Curfew Ordinance;”*
 - Adds *“as site in which Owner(s) and/or property is in violation of:”*
 - *Public Nuisances on Leased Property* per the Code;
 - *Minimum Vacant Housing Standards, Demolition of Uninhabited Structures Ordinances, Unsafe Buildings* per the Code;
 - *Unsanitary Health Nuisance Statutes* per Florida Statutes and the Code;
 - *Illegal dumping or illegal use of Property* per Florida Statutes and the Code;
 - *Environmental Protection Ordinance* per the Code and violations of Florida Statutes and Federal Environmental (Nuisance) Laws;
 - *False Alarm Ordinance* violations with *on a repeated basis six false alarm signals during two or more registration periods* per the Code;
 - *Place of habitation or feeding of Miami-Dade County Pit Bull Ordinance* per the Code;
 - *Illegal or Unlicensed Practice of Medicine, Dentistry, Funeral Services, or Health Care Services in Violation of Federal law and Florida Statutes...that may endanger the Public Health, Safety, and Welfare.*

Add definitions for:

- *Complaint* to include any complaint or incident documented on a local, state, or federal law enforcement report, citation, warning notice, notarized affidavit, oral or written sworn statement, or *reasonable belief (as substantiated by local, state, or federal law enforcement, judicial, or government officials);*
- *Owner* to include *property manager and business manager;*
- *Places/Premises* to include, but not limited to, *any residential, business, land, vacant lot, parking area, vessel, vehicle, area controlled by a homeowner or condominium or other similar association, or other property that comes within the control of business, or business enterprise, or other activity associated with a business; and*
- *Occasion* to include *each instance and/or day of activity.*

Updates notification processes and adds that notification to a business owner may constitute notification to the property owner.

PSC ITEM 4(E)
October 12, 2004

Adds subpoena power for the NAB and/or County Attorney.

Increases NAB membership to 13 (one per Commission District) in recognition that there are now 13 Commission Districts.

Authorizes non-residents of Miami-Dade County to be NAB members upon 2/3 vote of the BCC.

Authorizes alternate NAB members to be appointed by the Mayor, the County Manager, and the Director of MDPD or his designee subject to ratification by the BCC.

Ties NAB members' terms to the term of the appointing commissioner and sets 8 consecutive years as the term limit with ability to be reappointed after a 2-year hiatus.

Expands upon NAB hearing processes.

Provides authority for the NAB to consider *the general reputation of the Owner(s) or their associates, employees, or tenants, and evidence concerning other properties that may be owned, managed, or controlled by the Owner(s).*

Establishes a Prehearing Settlement process.

Authorizes the NAB to order fines in increments of \$250 or...higher or lesser amount as it deems appropriate and necessary, per incident and/or day of noncompliance.... not exceed[ing] \$15,000 (or a total amount as allowed by Florida Statute 893.138, as amended) each time a premises is declared a public nuisance. [See Attachment #1 for a copy of Florida Statute 893.138.]

Enforcement provisions specify:

- A \$250 fine for each day the Owner does not comply with the Board's Order or the property continues to be a public nuisance; and
- A \$500 fine and/or imprisonment in the county jail for not more than 60 days for any person who hinders, or obstructs, any County or State Official, in the discharge of duties...in carrying out the Orders of the Board.

Authorizes the NAB to recover costs for monitoring of the premises and/or investigation of all incidents and/or conditions....Costs include those of other departments and may include other Municipal, State, Federal Law Enforcement or Government Agency.

Removes the one year requirement before the County may foreclose on an unpaid lien.

Sets 18% per annum as the interest rate to accrue on unpaid costs and/or fines.

ECONOMIC IMPACT

The County Manager's "Fiscal Impact Report" attached (Handwritten pg. 5) to the item states that "*the revenue [from the proposed changes] cannot be accurately estimated in advance*" except that a new Administrative Officer 1 position at MDPD to administer the program "*will result in cost savings associated with reduced calls, less crime and disturbances on these properties*" in excess of the anticipated \$85,000 direct cost for salary and equipment for the new position.

Impact on municipalities: The proposed ordinance does not indicate whether or not municipalities will be charged fees for MDPD assistance with nuisance properties as is authorized in this item.

COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS

The broadness of some of the proposed provisions, and the absence of any exemptions, may have unintended consequences.

For example, if someone were to use the broadened definitions to file NAO complaints about covered activities that take place at public facilities such as like parks.

The extent of the expansion of NAO infractions and NAB authorities may give rise to concern from a civil liberties perspective.

Questions:

- *Will municipalities that choose to execute interlocal agreements with MDPD for assistance with nuisance properties be charged fees for these services?*
- *If fees will be charged, will older municipalities be charged the same fees as newer communities that are now required to pay for specialized police services?*